DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 893 CS 214 131

AUTHOR Flachmann, Kim
TITLE Terms and Conditions of Employment in the California State University.
PUB DATE Mar 93
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (44th, San Diego, CA, March 31-April 3, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Employee Responsibility; Employer Employee Relationship; Employment Practices; Higher Education; Occupational Surveys; *Part Time Faculty; *Personnel Policy; Teacher Employment; *Writing Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *California State University; English Teachers; *Wyoming Resolution

ABSTRACT

In the California State University system, some very unexpected hiring practices and faculty decisions have become clear through close scrutiny. For example, the numbers of English courses sections being taught by part-time non-tenure-track faculty has grown significantly over the past several years. Almost half of all English teachers are part-time instructors. At California State, contract protection has been extremely important to the faculty. In response to the Wyoming Resolution of 1989, adopted by the Conference on College Composition and Communication as the "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing," the composition coordinators at the 20 campuses in the California State system prepared a response. This response was based on information gathered through questionnaires given out to English faculty at all 20 campuses and it tried to represent the variety of voices noted in the 484 respondents. Survey results indicate a healthy consensus among faculty regarding contract details, salaries, promotion criteria, and other aspects of employment. However, serious differences remain concerning qualifications for writing instructors and the status to be accorded them. (A list of questionnaire items, responses, and other survey data, along with a copy of the California State University Statement of Principles Regarding the Teaching of College Writing, are included.) (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 893

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

by Kim Flachmann
California State University, Bakersfield

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Flachmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Introduction

Currently, more than one-half of the English faculty at two-year colleges and nearly one-third of the English faculty at four-year colleges and universities in our country are part-time and/or temporary. These percentages of non-tenure-track faculty members within our profession are much too high according to the "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" (a final draft of the Wyoming Conference Resolution): "When more than 10 percent of a department's course sections are taught by part-time faculty, the department should reconsider its hiring practices" (3). In the California State University, we did just that, and we discovered we have some very different, unexpected

CS214131

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

convictions of our own--some that support the original "Statement of Principles and Standards" and some that contradict it.

First, let's look at the setting for these convictions:

The California State University System is made up of 20 campuses, varying in size from 2,000 to 20,500 students.

In 1980, the number of faculty in the CSU was 17,808 (6,288 or 35% of whom were part-time).

In 1990, the number of faculty in the CSU was 21,202 (8,972 or 42% of whom were part-time).

In CSU English Departments, we have 1278 English professors--665 full-time, 613 part-time (nearly 50%).

Contract Protection

Within the entire CSU, contract protection is extremely important to the faculty. (We have been represented exclusively by the California Faculty Association [CFA] since 1980 when they won a shoot-out with University Professors of California [UPC]).
Following are the basic contract regulations governing part-time and full-time temporary faculty in the CSU; these are essential to an understanding of our collective reactions to the Wyoming Resolution.

1. When part-time faculty are contracted to teach 6 units (out of 15 units full-time; e.g., 1 remedial English class, with level and mode adjusted for heavy paper grading) for two consecutive quarters, they receive full benefits: health insurance, vacation time, sick leave, and retirement.

2. Benefits are figured at 30% of the salary step at which the person is hired (e.g., $9957 for Assistant Professors, step 8, figured at a $33,192 salary).

3. A part-time or full-time temporary faculty member cannot teach fewer courses than he/she taught the previous year if enrollment grows or remains constant.

4. Depending on their experience, full-time, temporary faculty are systematically placed on the CSU salary scale.

Since each faculty member teaching six units for two quarters draws the same benefit package that a full-time person does, assigning full loads to people teaching 6 units or more makes a great deal of financial sense. In fact, this particular set of agreements encourages the administration to hire large numbers of faculty to teach fewer than 6 units a quarter or a few full-time temporary faculty.

Unheard Voices

In 1989, after much revision and nationwide consultation, the Wyoming Resolution was adopted by the membership of the Conference on College Composition and Communication and printed in CCC (October 1989) as the "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing." Once this statement was in circulation, the Composition Coordinators from the 20 campuses that make up the California State University (who meet twice every year through an organization called the CSU English Council) put the document on their agenda and began to discuss its issues one by one. When we started to disagree with or qualify the CCC statement, we decided to take our own survey on this topic and compose a detailed response to the CCC document. Thus, a heretofore unheard voice in our discipline began to evolve.

In spring 1990, our English Council drafted two questionnaires based on the CCC statement and distributed them to all 20 campuses. We wrote form A for English Department Heads and Writing Directors to respond to and form B for the general department faculty. About 484 faculty representing 19 campuses responded to these questionnaires. From these responses, we composed a chart of our opinions and a draft of our collective thoughts on the issues relevant to the teaching of composition and the status of faculty doing the bulk of this instruction in the California State University system. We presented the individual responses; a profile of the respondents and their attitudes; and a draft of the resulting

document to the Composition Directors and other interested faculty at our fall 1990 English Council meeting. These faculty gave us clear directions for revising the statement, which we recast for our spring 1991 meeting.

Most important to the validity of this study is th fact that it represents a fairly large minority voice reacting to the published views of the majority in our discipline. The issues are the same, but quite a few of the answers are different. Somehow these voices need to be heard. A summary of the questions and their responses follows:

Opinions of Department Chairs and Composition Coordinators

1.) **What professional development opportunities are available for your part-time faculty?**

All nineteen campuses reported some type of professional development activities on their campuses.

2) **If you have a part-time pool, how does one get into that pool?**

Although answers to this question varied, all nineteen CSUs had clear guidelines for entering the pool of the part-timers on their campuses.

3) **What are the evaluation procedures for your part-time faculty?**

In response to this question, most campuses reported that they used a combination of student evaluations and some other method of evaluation, such as class visitation, personal data sheets, peer evaluations, department chair evaluations, and the like.

4) **What is the range of pay for your part-time faculty?**

In the CSU the pay ranges from $2,000 to $4,000 per course taught. These figures are based on the state salary scale.

5) **How do you establish the salaries for your part-time faculty?**

These salaries are located on a pay scale, and people are placed on that scale according to experience and training.

6) **What efforts do you make to provide job security for your part-time faculty?**

Most campuses reported that they consistently fight for a combination of early hiring, more than 6 units of teaching, full department voting rights, early class assignments, long-term appointments, and specific contracts for their part-timers.

7) **How would you assess the job satisfaction of your part-time faculty?**

The responses to this question ranged from **moderate** to **high**.

8) **What office space, phones, mailboxes, duplication privileges, and availability of secretarial help do your part-time faculty have?**

Responses to this question were quite varied. The office space ranges from two in an office to crowded "bull pens" (one room for all part-timers). Most part-timers in our system have access to a phone in their offices, although those in "bull pen" settings have only one telephone. Some even share desks; one campus reported three to a desk.

9) **Besides teaching and holding office hours, do your part-timers have other responsibilities? If so, what are they?**

Most campuses have no other responsibilities for the part-timers except to come to meetings and grading sessions related directly to their teaching assignments.

10) **How long can part-time faculty teach in your institution? If there is a limit, what is it and how was it arrived at?**

All nineteen campuses reported no limit on the length of time part-timers could teach on their campuses.

11) **Do your part-timers meet as an organized group? If they do, what are their main concerns?**

We discovered in reading the responses to this question that most part-timers in our system do not meet in organized groups.

12) **Do you think your writing program would be strengthened by the hiring of full-time Ph.D. faculty rather than part-time faculty? Why or why not?**

We got many passionate responses to these questions that ranged from the desire for only non-Ph.D.'s to teach writing to the opinion that writing should be taught by Ph.D.'s only.

But most campuses admitted that they were content with the blend of full-time and part-time faculty to give them flexibility in their hiring. They would prefer, however, that there be many more full-time faculty teaching composition than part-time.

Collective Faculty Opinions

Our second questionnaire was distributed to a cross-section of English faculty at all twenty campuses. We had a total of 484 responses representing nineteen CSUs. We also had a good balance of teaching assistants, tenure-track, part-time, and full-time faculty. What this group of faculty responded to was an attitude survey that

let us make specific generalizations about our system and the working conditions within that system.

Following is a copy of the questionnaire we distributed to these faculty along with a summary of their responses and the percentage of the total faculty responding (out of 484) who agreed with the statement.

Question	Percentage of Agreement
1) The teaching of writing should be left only to those trained in composition and rhetoric.	40%
2) All English faculty should be responsible for writing instruction.	53%
3) In regard to tenure and promotion considerations, publication in composition and rhetoric is on a par with other areas of research in English.	69%
4) In regard to tenure and promotion considerations, publication of a composition textbook should be considered a primary form of original research.	63%
5) In regard to tenure and promotion considerations, distinguished teaching and service should merit equal consideration with publication.	86%
6) Ideally, graduate students should teach no more than one course per term.	72%
7) Graduate students should present	

evidence of superior writing ability prior to being hired to teach writing courses.	88%
8) Graduate students should have had successful experience teaching writing or have had training in teaching writing prior to being hired to teach writing courses.	74%
9) Teaching assistants' special status among graduate students should be recognized by waiving their fees and tuition.	74%
10) Part-time faculty should be hired only to teach specialized courses for which no full-time faculty are available or to meet anticipated increases in enrollment.	35%
11) No more than 10% of a department's courses should be taught by part-time faculty.	36%
12) In order to be hired, part-time faculty should demonstrate superior writing ability and successful experience in the writing classroom.	82%
13) In order to be hired, part-timers should demonstrate knowledge of composition theory and pedagogy.	72%
14) Expectations for part-time faculty's teaching, service, and research should be made clear in writing at the time of hiring.	93%
15) Part-time instructors should be evaluated according to written expectations under which they were hired.	93%
16) Part-time instructors should be hired and given their assignments during the term prior to these assignments.	88%

17) When part-time instructors are hired, they should be given adequate introduction to their teaching assignments, departments, and institutions. 94%

18) Compensation, per course, for part-time faculty should never be lower than per course compensation for full-time faculty with comparable experience, duty, and credentials. 75%

19) Part-time faculty should be eligible for the same fringe benefits and for the same cost of living, seniority, and merit salary increases available to full-time faculty. 78%

20) Part-time faculty should be given mailboxes, office space, clerical support, and telephones. 92%

21) Part-time faculty should be given a voice in the formulation of policies regarding courses and programs in which they teach (for example, a vote on these issues at department meetings). 81%

22) Part-time faculty should have the same rights as full-time faculty to participate in the design of evaluation procedures. 74%

23) Part-time faculty should have access to research support and travel funds to attend professional conferences. 72%

24) During the period when departments are converting part-time positions to full-time, tenure-track positions, departments should offer long-term contracts to part-time faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching. 79%

25) Part-time faculty who have been employed for six or more terms or consecutively for three or more terms should not be terminated without a full term's notice. 85%

26) No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15 students.	89%
27) Remedial and developmental sections should be limited to a maximum of 15 students.	94%
28) Because rhetoric and composition is a rapidly developing field, all writing instructors should have access to scholarly literature and be given opportunities for continuing professional development.	91%
29) Because the teaching of writing requires so much individual attention to student writing, all instructors should have adequate and reasonably private office space for regular conferences.	97%
30) The institution should provide all necessary support services for the teaching of writing, including supplies, duplication services, and adequate secretarial assistance.	98%

CSU Statement of Principles Regarding the Teaching of College Writing*

As a result of the data we collected on these two sets of questionnaires, we drafted a document that represents these voices and their opinions on the status of writing instruction in the California State University. Following is a complete statement representing these collective responses.

INTRODUCTION

This document is the response of the English Council of the California State University System to the CCC Statement developed at the Wyoming Conference. It should be noted that this statement is the position of the CSUS English Council and not necessarily that of individual departments or of individuals within departments.

In its Spring 1990 meeting, the Composition Directors discussed the Wyoming Statement and felt that it needed further specification in some areas and somewhat broader scope in others to suit their particular needs. To this end, a sub-committee of the Composition Directors prepared and distributed (1) a questionnaire and (2) an attitude survey. The questionnaire was intended to give a general sense of who was responding to the attitude survey. The attitude survey itself addressed what the Composition Directors believed to be the most salient issues facing faculty and administrators engaged in teaching writing at the college level.

Upon receiving the questionnaire and attitude survey, the sub-committee tabulated the answers and incorporated those receiving 67% or greater favorable response into a draft statement of principles.

The draft statement was discussed at the Fall 1990 meeting of the Composition Directors. That body suggested further revisions. Those revisions were incorporated into a new draft statement that was discussed at the Spring 1991 meeting of the Composition Directors. A new statement was drafted and brought before the full English Council. That body is made up of Department Heads, Composition Directors, Heads of the Graduate Programs, and Secondary Education Supervisors. The Council as a whole suggested a few revisions and then approved the document. The document itself follows.

SECTION 1
TEACHING, SERVICE AND RESEARCH IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

In regard to considerations of retention, tenure, and promotion, publication of textbooks and research in composition and rhetoric should be evaluated in the same way as other publications and research in the field of English. In addition, administrative service should merit appropriate consideration along with other categories of evaluation.

SECTION 2
THE STATUS OF TEACHING ASSISTANTS IN COMPOSITION

Before being appointed to teach writing courses, teaching assistants should have had training in the teaching of writing or have presented evidence of successful prior experience in teaching writing. In addition, before being appointed to teach writing courses, teaching assistants should present evidence of superior writing ability.

Because the combination of teaching a writing course and pursuing a graduate degree is particularly demanding, teaching assistants should teach no more than two courses per term.

Because of their contribution to the university and to the English Department, teaching assistants' special status should be acknowledged by waiving their fees and tuition.

SECTION 3
THE STATUS OF LECTURERS AND PART-TIME FACULTY IN COMPOSITION

Prior to being hired, prospective part-time faculty and lecturers should demonstrate knowledge of composition theory and pedagogy, superior writing ability, and successful experience in the composition classroom.

Upon being hired, part-time faculty and lecturers should be made aware of the department's and the university's expectations regarding their performance. In addition, part-time faculty and lecturers should be given adequate introduction to their department, to the university, and to their teaching assignments--including knowing, whenever possible during the term prior to these assignments, what courses they will teach.

Because part-time faculty and lecturers are colleagues who are teaching demanding, college-level courses, they should be treated equally with their full-time colleagues. They should receive the same per-course compensation as that of their full-time colleagues with comparable duties, experience, and credentials.

They should never be given a course load which requires more than three preparations. They should be given mailboxes, office space, clerical support, as well as telephones and equal access to scholarly literature. They should have a voice in formulating policies regarding writing programs in which they teach. They should have a right to participate in the design of personnel evaluation procedures that affect them.

Should termination become necessary, part-time faculty and lecturers who have been employed for six or more terms or consecutively for three or more terms should be given a full term's notice prior to termination.

SECTION 4
THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WRITING IS TAUGHT

Because writing instruction requires continuous reading of student writing as well as many, extensive conferences with students, no more than twenty students should be permitted in any writing class, with fifteen being a more acceptable limit. Because remedial and developmental writing courses require more writing instruction and individual attention to students, these courses should be limited to a maximum of fifteen students. Because of the continuous individual attention to student writing that is necessary to effective writing instruction, all writing instructors should have adequate and reasonably private office space for regular conferences.

Conclusion

As we reconsider the data and the general CSU statement on the terms and conditions of employment for writing instructors, we can readily see a healthy consensus on contract details, salaries for writing instructors, and promotion criteria in the field of rhetoric. At the same time, there is little agreement on the qualifications of those who should teach writing and the status (tenured, non-tenured, full-time, or part-time) we should seek for these particular faculty assignments. The differences disclosed in this study of the CSU are significant and, I suspect, are much more representative o our profession's national reaction to this issue than the CCC statement, which implies general consensus in all areas related to this issue. Perhaps one of the reasons we remain so far from any national solutions to these problems is the basic theoretical differences revealed in this study.

*Data for this study compiled by David Kann, Director of the Writing Program at CSU, San Luis Obispo. Printed with permission of CCC (October 1991).